




CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:

"\ Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450"

on August 5, 2005


Edward A. Squillante, Jr.
Reg. No. 38,319
Attorney for Applicant(s)

August 5, 2005
Date of Signature

PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT
APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant: Coccaro et al.
Serial No.: 09/955,894
Filed: September 19, 2001
For: METHOD FOR PURCHASING CONSUMER PRODUCTS

Group: 3653
Examiner: J. Shapiro
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632
August 5, 2005

BRIEF FOR APPELLANTS


Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:


Enclosed herewith are three (3) copies of an Appeal Brief for Appellant.

Please charge the \$500.00 fee to our Deposit Account No. 12-1155. Any deficiency or overpayment should be charged or credited to this Deposit Account. This authorization is submitted in triplicate.

Respectfully submitted,


Edward A. Squillante, Jr.
Registration No. 38,319
Agent for Applicant(s)

EAS/pod
(201) 894-2925



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

PATENT

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:

"Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313"

on August 5, 2005

Edward A. Squillante, Jr.
Reg. No. 38,319
Attorney for Applicant(s)

August 5, 2005
Date of Signature

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant: Coccoaro et al.

Serial No.: 09/955,894

Filed: September 19, 2001

For: Method for Purchasing Consumer Products

Group: 3653
Examiner: Jeffery A. Shapiro
August 5, 2005

BRIEF FOR APPELLANTS

Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632
August 5, 2005

08/09/2005 MAHME1 00000006 121155 09955894

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant: Coccoaro et al.

Serial No.: 09/955,894

Filed: September 19, 2001

For: Method for Purchasing Consumer Products

Group: 3653

Examiner: Jeffery A. Shapiro

August 5, 2005

BRIEF FOR APPELLANTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Real Party In Interest	4
II. Related Appeals and Interferences	4
III. Status of Claims	4
IV. Status of Amendments.....	5
V. Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter	5-6
VI. Grounds of the Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal.....	6

VII. Argument.....	7-14
VIII. Conclusion.....	15
IX. Claims Appendix	16-18
X. Evidence Appendix	19
XI. Related Proceedings Appendix.....	20

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The Real Party in Interest in this Appeal is Unilever Home & Personal Care USA, a division of Conopco and a corporation of the State of New York.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Neither the Appellants, their legal representatives nor the Assignee are aware of any other Appeals or Interferences relating to the present Appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

This Appeal is taken from what is apparently the Final Rejection of claims 1 through 13, the pending claims in the application. A copy of the appealed claims is attached to this Brief as an Appendix. Moreover, in the Final Rejection dated March 2, 2005, the Examiner has not indicated that claim 7 is finally rejected on PTO Form 326.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A reply after the Final Rejection was filed on June 2, 2005. The reply was considered by the Examiner for purposes of this Appeal. No amendments after final were made by the Appellants.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The invention set forth in the claims on appeal is directed to a method for purchasing a consumer product in a refillable package at a point of purchase establishment. The method generates less environmental waste, and allows the consumer to easily purchase consumer products at reduced costs.

By the presently claimed invention, therefore, a superior method for purchasing a consumer product in a refillable package is described. As may be readily gleaned from, for example, pages 7-8 in the specification, the claimed method depicts an efficient and environmentally friendly way to purchase consumer products, and especially, consumer products that are heavy in nature.

In the Specification, the portion from page 1 to page 2 is background. The phraseology used in claims 1 may be found, for example, on page 3 of the specification as originally filed. Beginning at page 7, the invention claimed is illustrated.

VI. GROUNDS OF THE REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The issue raised in this appeal is primarily one of fact and of the type normally encountered in connection with a rejection made under 35 USC § 103. In particular, the issue is as follows:

Would one of ordinary skill in the art, upon reading Brown in view of Maniwa et al. and Brown in view of Rosenblum find it obvious to purchase a consumer product via a method that instructs a consumer to have the package of the consumer product refilled?

Moreover, would one of ordinary skill in the art upon reading Brown, in view of Maniwa et al. and further in view of Duvall find it obvious to fill a package for a consumer product a limited number of times as applied to the independent claim?

VII. ARGUMENT

I. Rejection Under 35 USC §103

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-13 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,578,763 (hereinafter, '763) in view of Maniwa et al., JP 11185164 A (hereinafter, '164). In the rejection, the Examiner continues to maintain, in summary, that the '763 reference discloses the information described in claims 1-6 and 8-13. Particularly, the Examiner asserts that the '763 reference discloses all limitations of claims 1-6 and 8-13 except for the important fact that product is sold at a sale price that includes a predetermined number of refills and the formula/method described in claim 11. The Examiner relies on the '164 reference for curing the vast deficiencies of the primary reference and continues to allege that the '164 reference discloses product being sold at a sale price that includes a predetermined number of refills. In view of the above, the Examiner believes that the 35 USC §103 rejection is warranted and that claims 1-6 and 8-13 are obvious.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's apparent position to the contrary, it is the Appellants' position, again, that the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the above-described for at least the following reasons.

As already made of record on numerous occasions, independent claim 1, is directed to a method of purchasing a consumer product comprising the steps of (a) selling a consumer product in a package to a consumer at a point of purchase establishment, and (b) instructing the consumer to retain the package after the consumer product has been consumed and (c) providing a means for the consumer to have the package refilled with consumer product wherein the product is sold at a sale price that includes a predetermined number of refills. The invention of claim 1 is further defined by the dependent claims which claim, among other things, the type of consumer product that can be purchased, the type of establishment that can sell the consumer product, packaging types, the characteristics of the packaging, the characteristics of the consumer product, and a specific mathematical formula that satisfies the method of purchasing such that a consumer saves money while simultaneously protecting the environment.

In contrast, and again, the '763 reference merely discloses a refillable bottle that is refilled in a machine with readable indicia on a container whereby the machine dispenses a discount coupon so that the consumer can use the coupon to pay the vendor at each and every refilling. Again, the present invention, as now defined in independent claim 1, is directed to a method whereby the consumer only has to pay the vendor a single time and the single sale price includes a predetermined number of refills. Thus, the present invention is significantly more efficient and consumer friendly

than the process described in the '763 reference which merely shows a method for vending a specific liquid consumer product whereby the consumer has to pay a vendor at every refill. Furthermore, there is nothing in the '763 reference that suggests the product being sold can be in form other than a liquid, and there is no teaching whatsoever in the '763 reference that even remotely suggests that the product can be in the form of a concentrate. Appellants respectfully point out to the Board of Appeals that after each refilling of the container described in the '763 reference, a discount coupon is dispensed to the vendee for use at a check-out station. The process of the '763 reference requires payment at a check-out station after every refill. (Please see column 2, lines 4-10)

In an attempt to cure the vast efficiencies of the '763 reference, the Examiner relies on the '164 reference which, as already made of record, merely discloses a non-analogous sale register. The sale register of the '164 reference (i.e., abstract) apparently describes a machine that is capable of registering ". . . , the sales number of actually selling the refill specified merchandise and the refill number of refilling it for respective time bands and the means for outputting the sales number, the refill number and the service rate of the merchandise based on them."

Again, the apparatus of the '164 abstract requires the consumer to pay/go to a service counter at every refill. Nothing in the '164 abstract "cures" any of the deficiencies of the

'763 reference as they relate to the presently claimed invention on appeal. In fact, the '763 reference and '164 abstract are deficient for the same reason.

In view of the above, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn and rendered moot.

II. Rejection Under 35 USC §103

The Examiner has, again, rejected claim 7 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Brown (the '763 reference) in view of Maniwa et al., (the '164 abstract) and further in view of Duvall, U.S. Patent No. 5,522,428 (hereinafter '428). In the rejection, the Examiner again maintains, in summary, that the '428 reference describes the limitations of claim 7 in that the predetermined number of times to refill will be less than the number of times that causes stress fractures in the package. In view of the above, the Examiner believes that the 35 USC §103 rejection to claim 7 is warranted.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's apparent position to the contrary, it is, again, the Appellants' position that the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the above-described for at least the following reasons.

As already made of record on numerous occasions, the present invention is directed to a method for purchasing a consumer product wherein the product is sold at a sale price

that includes a predetermined number of refills. Independent claim 1 is further defined by claim 7 wherein the consumer product which is sold in a package is sold in a manner such that the package is suitable to be refilled a predetermined number of times and the predetermined number of times is less than the number of times that would cause stress fractures in the package. As already made of record, the '763 reference teaches away from the present invention and teaches a method for refilling a container wherein the consumer must take a coupon dispensed from a refill machine and pay a vendor at each refill. The '164 apparatus is directed to a sale register. The '428 reference, again, is merely directed to a natural gas vehicle tank life sensor and control. The combination of references relied on by the Examiner does not, even remotely, teach, suggest, or disclose the invention set forth in the presently claimed invention. This invention is one where a consumer can make a single payment and have a container refilled a predetermined number of times, ensuring that the container will not break or stress fracture during the using and refilling period. There is no motivation whatsoever to combine the teachings of a reference that are directed to a natural gas vehicle tank with references directed to a sale register and a consumer product vending apparatus.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn and rendered moot.

III. Rejection Under 35 USC §103

The Examiner has, again, rejected claims 1-6 and 8-13 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Brown (the '763 reference) in view of Rosenblum, U.S. Patent No. 6,766,218 (hereinafter, '218). In the rejection, the Examiner maintains, in summary, that the '763 reference discloses all claim limitations set forth in claims 1-6 and 8-13 except for the fact that the teachings of the '763 reference do not disclose a product that is sold at a sale price that includes a predetermined number of refills. Moreover, the Examiner admits that the formula of claim 11 is not satisfied by the teachings of the '763 reference.

Nevertheless, the Examiner relies on the '218 reference for allegedly disclosing product being sold at a sale price that includes a predetermined number of refills and that satisfies the mathematical formula set forth in claim 11. In view of this, the Examiner believes the rejection is warranted.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's apparent position to the contrary, it is the Appellants' position that claims 1-6 and 8-13 are patentably distinguishable from the above-described for at least the following reasons.

The '763 reference, again, merely describes a refillable bottle that is refilled in a machine with readable indicia on a container whereby the machine dispenses a discount coupon so that the consumer can use the coupon to pay a vendor at every refilling. Again, the '218 reference merely describes an automatic prescription drug dispenser that includes a remote dispenser, a prescription entry system and a communications network. Involved is a communication network that coordinates communications between a doctor, an insurance carrier, and a remote dispenser. The remote dispenser stores, retrieves and labels prescription drug and over-the-counter products directly to patients to a remote automated vending machine. There is no teaching whatsoever in the '218 reference that even remotely cures the vast deficiencies of the '763 reference. Particularly, nothing in the '218 reference discloses a method for purchasing a consumer product where the product is sold at a sale price that includes a predetermined number of refills. Again, the present invention, as claimed, allows for the consumer to make one payment and then obtain a predetermined number of refills for a particular consumer product at a point of purchase establishment. The advantages of this invention are not described in the combination of references relied on by the Examiner, and the one time payment and the savings described by the formula of claim 11 are not suggested in the references relied on by the Examiner. In view of the same, it is clear that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required under 35 USC §103. Appellants, therefore, request that the obviousness rejection be withdrawn and rendered moot.


Appellants submit that all claims of record are now in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and favorable action are earnestly solicited.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Appellants respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Squillante, Jr.
Registration No. 38,319
Agent for Applicant(s)

EAS/pod
(201) 894-2925

IX. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method for purchasing a consumer product comprising the steps of:
 - (a) selling a consumer product in a package to a consumer at a point of purchase establishment;
 - (b) instructing the consumer to retain the package after the consumer product has been consumed; and
 - (c) providing a means for the consumer to have the package refilled with consumer product

wherein the product is sold at a sale price that includes a predetermined number refills.

2. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the consumer product is a cereal, shampoo, hair conditioner, beverage, cream or ointment, laundry detergent or fabric softener.

3. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the consumer product is a laundry detergent or fabric softener.

4. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the point of purchase establishment is a mini-mart, department store, club-store or supermarket.

5. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the package is a bottle, bag, sachet or box.

6. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the package is a bottle for carrying a laundry detergent or fabric softener.

7. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the package is suitable to be refilled a predetermined number of times, the predetermined number of times being less than a number of times that causes stress fractures in the package.
8. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein product is a flake, granule, tablet, powder, paste, slurry or liquid.
9. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the product is a liquid detergent or liquid fabric softener.
10. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the package has an information device and is refilled by being placed in association with a refilling device having an information detector for reading information about the product off of the information device.
11. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the method satisfies the formula $P_O < P_T + (P_T)N'$

where $P_O = P_T + (P_R)N$
 P_O = original purchase price of a consumer product;
 P_T = typical purchase price of a consumer product;
 P_R = refill price;
 N = a defined number of refills;
 N' = a defined number of purchases; and
 $N = N'$

and further wherein less environmental waste is generated and the consumer pays less money for the consumer product.

12. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the product is a laundry detergent concentrate.

13. The method for purchasing a consumer product according to claim 1 wherein the product is a fabric softener concentrate.

X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131 and/or 1.132 is submitted herewith.

XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

No decisions rendered by a Court or the Board have been made; therefore, no such decisions are submitted herewith.